F5C8JOHS 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 V. 14 Cr. 550 (PKC) 5 JOHN RE, 6 Defendant. -----x 7 8 May 12, 2015 11:50 a.m. 9 Before: 10 HON. P. KEVIN CASTEL 11 District Judge 12 APPEARANCES 13 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the 14 Southern District of New York ANDREW C. ADAMS 15 Assistant United States Attorney 16 CHRISTOPHER FLOOD 17 Attorney for Defendant 18 Also present: MERIDITH SAVONA, FBI 19 BRET CARLSON, FBI KATE HADLEY, Paralegal 20 21 22 23 24 25

(Case called)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Government ready?

MR. ADAMS: Good morning, your Honor. Andrew Adams for the United States. With me at counsel table is Special Agent Meridith Savona and Detective Bret Carlson.

For the Court's information, there are a number of victims in the audience today. I just point them out to the Court.

THE COURT: We will be getting to that shortly. For the defendant.

MR. FLOOD: Good morning, your Honor. Christopher Flood, Federal Defenders of New York, on behalf of Mr. Re, who is seated at counsel table. Also with me at counsel table is a paralegal from our office, Ms. Kate Hadley.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning to you all.

Mr. Flood, the first thing I want to do is go through with you the materials that I have, and the question will be whether I have everything I should have.

I have a presentence report, recommendation and addendum from probation, dated February 20, 2015. I have a memorandum from you with Exhibits A through I, dated April 28, 2015. I also have from you a letter dated May 11, 2015, which annexes additional letters of support.

I have from the government a letter dated May 5, 2015, which helpfully came with a CD-ROM or DVD-ROM which contain a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

variety	of	materials,	which	Ι	have	reviewed,	including	some
victim	stat	tements.						

I have a letter dated May 11, which was handed up to me, and it is from an individual Anders Karlsson, and I have not read it, don't know what it relates to, but I will read it in a moment.

I also have a proposed order of restitution and a preliminary order of forfeiture as to specific property as well as a consent preliminary order of forfeiture money judgment.

Mr. Flood, do I have everything I should have?

MR. FLOOD: I believe you do, Judge.

THE COURT: Same question for the government.

MR. ADAMS: Yes, your Honor.

And the May 11 letter from Mr. Karlsson is a victim impact statement that was given to me today.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Flood, has the defendant read, received and reviewed the presentence report, recommendation and addendum?

MR. FLOOD: Yes.

THE COURT: Does the defendant have any objections to the facts set forth in the presentence report?

MR. FLOOD: No, your Honor, other than that that's mentioned within the presentence report, the second disclosure mentions one of our objections.

THE COURT: This relates to the nolo contendere

1	conviction in a Texas court, is that correct?
2	MR. FLOOD: That's correct.
3	THE COURT: And I understand the government has no
4	objection to excluding that conviction from my consideration in
5	this case.
6	MR. ADAMS: That's correct, your Honor.
7	THE COURT: So it will be excluded from consideration.
8	With that one change, does the defendant have any
9	other objection to the facts set forth in the presentence
10	report?
11	MR. FLOOD: No, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Does the government have any objections to
13	the facts set forth in the presentence report?
14	MR. ADAMS: No, your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Based upon my review, I adopt as my
16	findings of fact the facts set forth in the presentence report.
17	With regard to the guideline calculation, I propose to
18	conclude that the defendant is in total offense level 20,
19	Criminal History Category II, and that the guideline range for
20	imprisonment is therefore 37 to 46 months' imprisonment, with
21	the applicable fine range of 7500 to 5 million.
22	Any objection from the defendant?
23	MR. FLOOD: No, your Honor.
24	THE COURT: Same question for the government.

MR. ADAMS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I adopt those as my guideline determinations.

I will now give Mr. Flood an opportunity to speak on behalf of the defendant.

MR. FLOOD: Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, this has a very complicated history. In this case, I think a reasonable first impression that the Court, taking a look at the allegations, could think that Mr. Re's conduct might have come from a much more sophisticated person than Mr. Re in fact actually is.

The history and the complexity and the nature of the scheme notwithstanding, Mr. Re himself is, in fact, an incredibly damaged, incredibly weakened person that we have gone some distance to try and present to the Court, and I hope that the attachments that we have given your Honor, certainly from Dr. First, substantiate it.

This is a gentleman whose personal history is nothing short of horrifying, and the effects of that personal history on his mental state are real, and that mental state has had a specific and direct effect on the offense conduct in this case.

Mr. Re really was uniquely, and I guess the word I am searching for here is vulnerable to his own weaknesses, living where he was, in the environment of Eastern Long Island.

If I can just indulge in the Court's patience for a moment. Eastern Long Island is the Hamptons, a place of

immense wealth and really striking class differences, a place where Mr. Re is really on the low end of those class differences, and where Jackson Pollock paintings and the sort of art world out there presented an opportunity to really just leap into a different world of security, which he desperately needed for his family, which in the PSI sets forth the incredible health struggles Mr. Re's family has been suffering with for at least the last 15 years, the cancer that his daughter suffered at a very young age.

If I could just take a moment to point out that many members of his family are here in the courtroom today, although his daughter, Amanda Re, who I am speaking of right today, couldn't be here because she had child-care responsibilities back in Eastern Long Island. His daughter Amanda had cancer at age eight and had to have a leg bone removed right at the same time that this offense conduct began. But here in the courtroom today is Rhonda Re, his wife; Gloria Re, his mother; Alexia Re, his other daughter; and Christopher, a close family friend from the neighborhood.

But along with his daughter's cancer, also his wife has been cancer stricken twice, a long-term degenerative disease, Lyme disease, has been in the family. His mother has had some health struggles. His father had renal failure and was struggling towards the end of his life. So the concept that Mr. Re could help was right there as a massive temptation,

and so many fraud cases begin this way.

Jackson Pollock, as I am sure the Court has seen in the media, and perhaps in other cases, and I think some of the materials even perhaps presented by the government, but I know presented by us, this artwork is fraught with contested authenticity. I am not an expert, but certainly there is a contest out there about which are authentic Pollocks and which aren't. And Mr. Re fell victim to his own hopes and dreams about how, perhaps, he could leap into a place of greater security for his family here. But it's related to his need to be somebody else, to be somebody, that's directly related to the struggles that he went through as a child and the incredibly fraught mental illness that Dr. First identifies.

Dr. First is not the kind of psychiatrist who is just going to sign off on this kind of diagnosis. He is hardly somebody who is a fly-by-night physician. He took a long look at Mr. Re. And the government's attempts, enthusiastic as they are, to suggest that Dr. First should be ignored, as he only talked to Mr. Re and his family, that's just what psychiatrists do. I don't know who else he should have talked to, perhaps the victims in the case, I don't know.

Dr. First talked to Mr. Re, as he should have, and he reviewed Dr. Friedes' notes and records as he should have. And he found that Mr. Re's issues are real, and they are substantial, and they are long held, and they are extremely

unique. And Mr. Re's conduct here related, again, to this need to fill a hole in his personality. It's almost fabulous to try and invent this provenance to his life, to become something, to believe in something, and, really, when Dr. First is talking about the submarine, the Deep Quest, and there is a moment of great candor between Mr. Re and Dr. First about the Deep Quest, which isn't the Deep Quest, it's a mockup of a movie prop of a submarine that looks like the Deep Quest, but it's not the USS Deep Quest which has great historical significance and is in a museum on the West Coast.

THE COURT: In the state of Washington. And he said to Dr. First, I wanted it to be true.

MR. FLOOD: I wanted it to be true.

THE COURT: I have read it.

MR. FLOOD: So much of that underlies exactly what Mr. Re's offense conduct is about about these paintings. He believed and wanted this to be true. Because it would make him the person who actually was close to Jackson Pollock, and actually was meant something in East Hampton, and was cool with the art world, and was actually friends with Brad Pitt.

But when he got this money, what did he do with it?

He tried to become somebody different than actually who he was.

He didn't just get different color contacts. He went to Jordan and tried to change his eye color. This is a person who is trying to become somebody different, trying to become somebody

21

22

23

24

25

F5C8JOHS 1 actually substantial. 2 THE COURT: Let me ask a basic question. 3 MR. FLOOD: Sure. 4 THE COURT: Your client has not objected to the facts 5 set forth in the presentence report, and I have therefore adopted them as my findings of fact. The Jackson Pollocks and 6 7 the Willem de Koonings are fakes, correct? MR. FLOOD: To the extent that we have any idea, yes. 8 9 THE COURT: Where did he get them from? Who painted 10 them? How did he come in possession of them? 11 MR. FLOOD: As he said in his --12 THE COURT: He declined to discuss his offense conduct 13 with the office of probation on the advice of counsel. 14 MR. FLOOD: That's right. 15 THE COURT: So I am asking the question. You can answer it or refrain from answering it. 16 17 MR. FLOOD: Your Honor, as he said in his allocution, 18 he found them in a storage bin in Manhattan. 19

As Mr. Re said to me, West East is the name of the storage place in Manhattan.

THE COURT: I don't even know what that means, find it in a storage unit. Find it in his storage unit? Find it in somebody else's storage unit? Find it in a hallway of the storage company?

MR. FLOOD: The storage units are auctioned,

typically, when they are no longer paid for, and people obtain the storage units, and then once they obtain the storage units, they get what is inside them.

THE COURT: And?

MR. FLOOD: And inside them was these paintings.

THE COURT: You left something out. Someone purchased this at an auction or this man purchased it at an auction?

MR. FLOOD: I am hearing this out of my right ear and speaking out of my mouth. So if I could just have a moment.

THE COURT: Sure. Take your time.

(Pause)

MR. FLOOD: So according to Mr. Re, his brother, Charles Re, was purchasing storage units for a living at an auction, which is not uncommon, and they purchased this unit and that's where they obtained the painting.

THE COURT: Wouldn't there be documentation of that story if that were true?

MR. FLOOD: I would expect so.

THE COURT: So your client adheres to the possibility that these are Jackson Pollock originals, is that what I am hearing today?

MR. FLOOD: No, your Honor. We are somewhat bewildered by the position the government took in their letter, because what they ignored in their letter was the clause that Mr. Re stipulated to on page 22 of the transcript of the plea,

F5C8JOHS

in which he specifically disclaimed the authenticity of the paintings. That was part of the plea agreement, and it's in the PSI as well.

So, they pointed out something about 2005, saying that that was somehow artfully crafted. That's the indictment. The indictment says from 2005 forward, and so he allocuted to 2005 forward, which on advice of counsel, which is exactly how the work is done in this district. That's not artfully crafted by Mr. Re; it's the federal defenders advising Mr. Re what to say because it tracks the indictment. There is nothing about him playing fast and loose about language there.

And then the specific language on page 22, and it's in the government's exhibit, where Mr. Adams says it is a unique extra piece to the allocution in this case, we are asking for a stipulation that says nothing that was ever sold was authentic. That's exactly what he said.

THE COURT: What did Mr. Re do with the money?

MR. FLOOD: It's been wasted between trips to Jordan, spent on refurbishing this ridiculous submarine.

THE COURT: He says he spent a million dollars on refurbishing the submarine, but he was unable to produce any documentation for that.

MR. FLOOD: Over the course of years. It was down in a shipyard in Galveston I believe.

THE DEFENDANT: Pier 77.

THE COURT: There is no invoices for that. 1 2 THE DEFENDANT: I never got invoices from Rick Ryan, 3 the owner of the marina, but if I knew I had to have them, I 4 would have had them. THE COURT: The presentence report was issued in 5 6 February. It notes that the defendant had not come up with any 7 documentation for the claim. It's been available to be reviewed by counsel. And if anybody had any documentation that 8 9 they wanted to provide, having read the statement in the 10 presentence report, presumably, they would have provided it. 11 What do I make of the fact that according to the 12 presentence report, the defendant disclosed an automobile, a 13 Dodge Viper, to the marshal service, but didn't list it on his 14 assets. 15 MR. FLOOD: He sold the Viper. I have asked him about that. The 2006 Viper, he had sold it before the --16 17 THE COURT: When that showed up in the presentence 18 report, did anybody tell probation that or give them some 19 support for that? 20 No, your Honor. MR. FLOOD: 21 THE COURT: Go ahead. 22 MR. FLOOD: Well, where do we pick up again? 23 Can I have a moment? 24 (Pause)

MR. FLOOD: Your Honor, the best that I can understand

Mr. Re's net worth right now, having been to his household, is its definitely in the red. I have walked the grounds of their home. It is small, to say the least. It's crowded. And to the extent that there are any assets, it's the submarine, which is a strange statement indeed to be saying out loud.

Mr. Re himself is on a battery of medications dealing with the psychiatric issues, and that is a relatively recent development in his life. As he said in his letter to the Court, which I am sure the Court has studied well, I think he says this kind of thinking, sort of consequential thinking, has come relatively late in life. And I think that's a candid and true statement from him. He has lost a lot behind his offense conduct in this case.

From the frauds here, he may have gained money, which from our ability to discern is gone, but he did lose relationships. He lost friendships. He did consider these people to be friends. And one thing that we know from the letters that are submitted, and it is part of the complexity that Mr. Re presents, is that he is an incredibly valuable person to the people that care about him and he cares about. He is a valued father, husband, son. As a member of his community, their home is open to people who need help. And possibly because Mr. Re has needed that help and didn't get it when he needed it, he is an incredibly generous person, to the point of almost irrationality, giving away the things that he

needs to people who are in need, homeless people.

To be completely candid, reading some of the letters, when I was reading them they didn't sound true to me, until I started reading them in sequence, like him going into burning cars to pull people out. That sounded entirely self-serving, until reading it from the perspectives of other people saying, no, this is actually true, this really happened. And Mr. Re, and his character, really is the type of person who would go into a burning car to pull someone out, a stranger. And how to harmonize that with the character that is presented so dimly in the victim statements, the only way that it makes sense, from the defense perspective, and I think it is really true, is the sort of self-aggrandizement that Dr. First speaks to.

So where does that leave the Court? Because I think, obviously, the Court has the power to just imprison Mr. Re, and I know that there are plenty of angry victims here who want to see that happen, but I don't think that solves any problems. That certainly punishes, but is that just punishment, because where does that leave us? And where does that leave Mr. Re and will he get the proper psychiatric treatment he needs in prison? I sincerely doubt it. And will that really address the underlying causes of this significant problem that brought him to this issue?

We strongly urge the Court that it won't, that what we propose is really the solution here. If some form of directed

punishment, be it home confinement, a powerful message through community service that builds on the true character that John Re has, with the requirement that he continue the psychiatric treatment that he truly needs, will answer the issues that actually caused this fraud and will allow him to work.

THE COURT: Let me say for the record, for both the benefit of the government and for defense counsel, I am considering a sentence outside the advisory guideline range. I have considered and will consider one below the advisory guideline range, and I have and will consider one above the advisory guideline range. So I want to state that for the record to the extent that is relevant to either set of counsel.

MR. FLOOD: So, obviously, in light of the Court's comment, we are strongly urging the Court to consider below the guideline range. We do not feel that prison is appropriate here. The issue is again what brought Mr. Re to his conduct. And where I want to end is where I really began. This is a man with severe mental health issues that are the product of immense childhood trauma, which I have gone on at length, or Dr. First really went on at length on paper, and for the benefit of the remaining privacy Mr. Re has I am not going to belabor in public here, but I know the Court understands what I am talking about. It was violent and persistent and absolutely justifies the kind of mental break that Mr. Re certainly has had. And that mental break, joined to all the other pressures

in life, I am not saying it's an excuse, but it's an explanation for this kind of offense conduct.

It is one thing if he is just out there trying to find a way around legitimate employment to try and create a fraud to make money. You say, OK, deterrence has its maximal value for white-collar crime. That's one thing. But that's not the situation Mr. Re presents. We have a mental health crisis that Mr. Re is. He is a persistent mental health crisis, and he can get the right treatment, and he is in it now, and to disrupt that will present problems later.

So the invitation to incarcerate for how long?

Forever? Even as stern as I know the Court has been in the past, we can't do that forever. The point is to deter. And the key ingredients for deterrence for Mr. Re, for specific deterrence, the first ingredient for that is contrition, right? The conscious awareness that he has done something wrong. And this man has been lacerating himself for the entire time that I have been representing him. His knowledge that he has done something wrong, the pain that he expresses in our consultations, it's made it across the page from what he has lost and what he has done to other people, the loss of his personal sense of honor is very real and very candid.

So, for as much as I think the defense and government have not quite met eye to eye in our submissions, I really think there is a lot more clarity here about who Mr. Re is and

the responsibility he has taken, and I think that really points towards a substantial departure from the guidelines, a direction of nonincarceration, mental health treatment, and allowing this man to be there for his family who need his help, to build towards restitution, which, by the way, the submarine is not an insubstantial asset, but allow him to pay back the wrongs that he has done, which he wants to do so badly, and to continue that momentum. His means are modest, but he wants to be able to do that.

If I could just have a moment.

(Pause)

MR. FLOOD: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Flood.

Mr. Re, this is your opportunity to speak, to address the Court directly, to bring to my attention any facts or circumstances that you believe I should take account of in passing sentence upon you today. If there is anything you want to say, Mr. Re, this is the time to say it.

THE DEFENDANT: I have been having a pretty hard time lately thinking about all of this. I am 55 years old. No 55-year-old wants to go to jail. I did something wrong. I lied. I know what I did. I also know that I am not going to try and fight nothing here, but I could say to you that I have been fooled many times myself. I have lots of fake art in my shed that I can never sell again because I know it's fake, and

I bought it. I understand what my victims must feel. I had a love for John Szemansco, and especially Peter King, he was a very good friend of mine, and now I don't know if I will ever even talk to him again.

I can honestly say that I didn't know if they were real or wrong. I didn't. And I didn't know who to go to with them. So I asked Vered Gallery in East Hampton if they were right with one of the de Koonings. I tried to get some advice when I first found them, before I sold one. And they bought 22 de Koonings from me saying that they were authentic, and some were authenticated, some weren't, some were knocked down just like those.

I was a woodworker. I had over 300 sales of art and antiques, and especially art books, on eBay, and I have never had one negative complaint from a buyer. And they are allowed to leave the complaint or the compliment to their satisfaction on eBay for everyone to read to see what kind of buyer you are. Are you an honest buyer? Are you a con man? If you don't have any feedbacks, and obviously you keep changing your name because you are a con man. I stayed with the same two accounts for 12 years and had a very good reputation, and I have excellent feedbacks, over 300, which I should have brought them but I didn't. If you want them, I will mail them to you directly tomorrow if you feel you want to see them. I have never had a person come to me and say, why did you sell me this

F5C8JOHS

fake?

Then I had an unfortunate incident where I decided that I would take art for the Pollocks instead of money. And I found myself in a situation where I accepted 24 Picasso's, that would have been worth 50 to 60 million dollars if real, and to me they looked very real, and I thought this was a great thing. I thought, wow, people are going to get rich. I have always retained a percentage of what I sold. I have never read of anybody that was trying to rip somebody off that tried to stay married to who they sold the art to. And all those Picasso's came from collector number two, the main reason I am here today. He gave me fake art and traded it for my art, and all his art turned out to be fake too.

And we talked about it and I told him, don't worry about it, because we knew we were taking a risk. We never knew that these were real or right, and he agreed with me, and I have the e-mail. And that was a communication that John Szemansco never reflected to the Court, that I made clear, I don't know, you're buying these on your own, and if I were you I would do some homework, and he never did. I didn't want to hurt John. John is divorced with a single son, and he is a good man, and everybody I have dealt with, to me, seemed to be at least trying very hard to be legitimate and straightforward with me.

I am not what these papers say I am. I will tell you

right now I am not what these papers say I am. I swear to you on my grandson. These papers are horrible. Every one of these reports that talk about me are horrible. They make me out to be some guy that wants to rip people off and go out there and steal pocketbooks from old ladies. And I'm not that person.

Sorry for raising my voice, your Honor. I'm sorry.

But I have got to tell you, you want to hear it from me, I will tell you, OK. I have given more to people homeless, and I have saved more lives and risked my life for people, and now I am going to go to jail for selling fake art that I didn't even know was fake when they were giving me fake art back. I will make full restitution. I tell you right now, your Honor, I will make restitution to everyone that wants it. I will do it in a shorter period of time than you think. I will. I will work like a dog. I will do whatever I have to, legally obviously.

I don't know what else to do. I have been crying every day with my family for the last month. OK? My daughters tell me they don't want me to leave home, and I say, I can't help it, they are going to put me in jail. What am I supposed to do? I didn't know these damn things were fakes. And you know what, there's laboratories that say they are real.

Meridith Savona came to my house and showed me a thing where I said authentic on eBay. She didn't know it had a forensic lab report. She told the newspaper I was mentally

ill. People were making fun of me to my daughters because they said your father is a retard or something. You're not supposed to tell newspapers about my mental illness. That's against the law. I have been stepped on like a cockroach from everybody in this investigation. I am excluding you, your Honor, of course.

If you can see it through somehow to just -- I will make an agreement with you, your Honor, that if I didn't follow through with everything that you wanted me to do, then you know what, you can throw me in jail for whatever time you want. But if you just give me one chance to make up for this, and make it right, I will make you proud. I will make you glad that you made that decision. I will. I will do it legally. I will do what you want me to do. I will make it better. But I can't make it better in jail. What am I going to do in jail? I am not going to go to jail at 55. They are going to end up locking me up in some crazy ward because sometimes -- I just forgot what I was saying.

Give me five years' house arrest and watch me for ten years. I don't care. You will see I will not make any more mistakes. This is the biggest lesson of my life. And I have made mistakes before, and you know it, I know you do. I am ashamed that I didn't know. I should have taken the time and done some homework.

The storage unit was also filled with a lot of African art. I sold some of that too and it turned out to be all real.

But it wasn't very expensive stuff; it was a low price, 2,000, 3,000, 500. The idea that that art was real led me inside to say that everything in this unit, I just hit the jackpot of my life, God just put his hand upon me and said, I am going to bless you with this storage unit, and now here I am facing jail.

I wish my brother was here to tell you how excited I was. I had tears in my eyes. I thought I would be able to — I was going to start a homeless foundation because I have something about the homeless, because when I was younger I had a hard time and I left home and I lived in Penn Station for a while. I was homeless, and I know what it is like for these people to be out there. I am just adding that because I need you to know what I do and who I am. And I know I make a lot of mistakes. I just heard on the news the other day that the average American commits three felonies a day and doesn't know it.

I am trying to find the correct words so that you take into your heart, just take into your heart that I will make this right. I can make this right. I am not some 23-year-old kid that ripped off a bank or a drugstore. I have a lot of intelligence. I am a smart person and I have this film business that somebody wants to start with me. It would be an amazing success and I could make restitution. I can try and rebuild my house, which is literally sinking. Right now there

is no gas in my tanks for hot water and the electric is going to be shut off today, and I can prove that to you.

I am in a whirlwind. I am in a perfect storm, as Jeff Marder said in his letter, and I can't get out. I can't get out without your help. It's the only way. Everybody is going to tell you how bad I am, what a bad person I am. Why? I know I threatened Carl, but I never followed through with a threat in my life, not one.

Your Honor, my father told me never to beg no matter what, take your licks like a man. I am going to ask you as a man to man, please just see more than what is in front of you, please look further. All I ask is give me another chance.

That's all I ask. You will not regret it. You will not regret it.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Re.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor, for listening.

THE COURT: This is the government's opportunity to speak, and I will hear from the government whether there are any victims who wish to be heard orally. I have the written victim statements. I do want to take a moment to read the one that was handed up today.

(Pause)

THE COURT: How does the government wish to proceed?

MR. ADAMS: Thank you, your Honor.

I will begin just by identifying the victims who are

F5C8JOHS

in the courtroom today. Mr. McMaster, whose letter you have.

It is my understanding that Mr. McMaster wishes to just rely on
the letter that was submitted to you.

Mr. Szemansco is also here in the courtroom today, as is Mr. Karlsson. I checked with them before your Honor took the bench. They were still considering whether they wished to say anything.

THE COURT: You want to take a moment to find out?

MR. ADAMS: Yes, sir. Thank you.

(Pause)

MR. ADAMS: Thank you. Mr. Szemansco would like to say a few words to the Court. Mr. Karlsson will rest on his letter.

THE COURT: Mr. Szemansco, if you wish to be heard, you can come right up to the podium here.

Just please state your full name for the record, first and last name, and spell it if you will.

MR. SZEMANSCO: John Szemansco, S-Z-E-M-A-N-S-C-O.

THE COURT: Please proceed.

MR. SZEMANSCO: Thank you for giving me the opportunity.

I am glad I got a chance to hear Mr. Re speak because it reminded me of how convincing he is not only in the statements that he makes, but how convincing he was regarding the art over the period of years that I have known him.

A couple of things have come to mind, and it's interesting regarding the storage shed, because Mr. Re knows very well how important provenance is, and knowing him he would have gone to the end of the earth to find out where those paintings came from instead of planting the shills in provenance.

It's not just the fact that I lost 32 years of my retirement. I will survive that. It's not the fact that I just pulled my third house out of foreclosure. I am surviving that. I think what is more important for you to consider, your Honor, is that the art world needs to be sent a message, and people who also create false art knowingly, as John Re did know, that needs to be sent very clear with a strong sentence and a maximum sentence for him.

John Re is a very smart individual. He is very calculating. John Re knew exactly what he was doing. He ordered a lot of notarized letters and statements regarding the provenance. He never wavered over it, over anywhere from five to six years. He lived it, breathed it, and I believe that at this particular point he should pay for it.

If John Re gets back out on this street, if he doesn't do this with art, he is going to do it with something else.

His intentions of paying back his victims, the fact that a woodworker is going to pay back three, four million dollars, after he pays taxes on that money, it's impossible. I believe

also John Re has that money; not all of it, I think he spent a lot of it, but he at one time told me they will never find the money. He has got it buried. Don't kid yourself.

I am really and truly hoping that there is justice here today, not only for myself, but for all the people in the art world who are fighting people like John Re, who are introducing these type of paintings and drawings that is confusing, manipulating, and victimizing a lot of other people that may not even find it out for years and years. So I am just asking for a maximum sentence on this, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir.

I will hear from Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: I was going to speak a bit about the victims in this case, who actually purchased art, and the millions of dollars that were spent on Mr. Re's paintings, but I think Mr. Szemansco eloquently spoke to that point.

What I would like to focus on instead, your Honor, is what, to me, is the lasting image of this case and sort of an emblematic image of this case. It is a breakfast table at a house in Long Island sometime in 1999. Barbara Schulte is there, it's her home, which is an unpretentious home in East Hampton. Ms. Schulte had cooked breakfast, she made muffins, and she was serving John Re and another woman, who was an art dealer. Mr. Re mentioned that person just a moment ago, a representative of Vered Gallery. And they were in Barbara

Schulte's house in 1999 having breakfast. The art dealer was there to hear firsthand about the Schulte provenance, and she did. Mr. Re sat there. Ms. Schulte sat there. And they discussed the treasure-trove of artwork in the Schulte basement, and the Vered Gallery walked away with the impression that that provenance was real and that the artwork that Mr. Re was offering was substantiated.

That story is not a figment. That story is not a fantasy. That has been told to the government and agents of the government by Mr. Re himself. It's been told to the government by the Vered Gallery owner. And it was mentioned on a phone call from Barbara Schulte to a representative of the de Kooning Foundation, and there are notes of that call that I provided as an exhibit to my sentencing submission. That meeting happened.

To me, the picture of that conversation says a lot about the nature of this crime and the nature of this defendant. Mr. Re was willing to sit down across the table from Barbara Schulte, elderly, slipping a bit in her mind at that point, and to convince her that there was a trove of artwork in her own basement. And for whatever reason, whether because she herself believed it at that point or because she didn't have the power to contradict him, she sat there and was manipulated over and over again by Mr. Re so that he could make millions of dollars through the sale of these paintings. It's

an image of exploitation. I think it speaks directly to the nature of this defendant and the nature of this crime that took place over the course of over a decade.

A lot of people lost a lot of money in this case. But I think the exploitation of Barbara Schulte, in her state at that time, and the memory of her husband, is really at the core of this defendant's crime. I think his nature, his characteristics, the nature of this crime, the pain that was wrought on his community, on the victims in this case, all of those speak towards an incarceratory sentence, and we stand by our recommendation that the guideline stipulation is eminently reasonable in this case.

Thank you.

THE COURT: This is the Court's statement of reasons for the sentence to be imposed on John Re.

In sentencing the defendant, I have considered all of the materials that I referenced at the outset of this proceeding. I have considered the very thoughtful and extended comments of Mr. Flood orally today, the statement of Mr. Re, the statement of Mr. Adams, and the statement from the victim. I have considered all of the factors under Section 3553(a). I need not recount all that I have considered, but I will touch on some of the matters that I have considered.

There is no question that John Re suffers from a mental illness. Millions of Americans do, and they do not

commit criminal acts because of their mental illness. I am convinced that John Re committed his crimes not as a result of his mental illness, perhaps in part as a result of a desire to feel grandiose, but as I will say a little bit more about Dr. First, Dr. First himself states that while Mr. Re's criminal behavior does not appear to be a direct result of his psychiatric disorder, there is little question that these disorders had an impact on his behavior. I think that is a fair statement.

John Re is a facile liar. I say liar because lying has been a way of life for over a nine-year period. I say facile because he planned his deception well and was reasonably successful in carrying it out. He entered a plea of guilty to planning and engaging in a nine-year scheme to defraud persons into believing that they were purchasing original works of Jackson Pollock and Willem de Kooning with a provenance that made them real, when in truth the provenance was a lie. He sold 74 paintings under false pretenses, and the total amount of restitution owed by Mr. Re is \$2,225,807.

To effectuate the scheme, Re had to come up with a plausible story of how he acquired the paintings. Barbara Schulte was a convenient source of a story. Re repeatedly told victims that the paintings were given to George Schulte, a woodworker and antique restorer living and working in East Hampton, not far from where Pollock and de Kooning lived.

Pollock died in 1956 and de Kooning in 1997, both were members of the New York School of Abstract Impressionism.

Re claimed that after the death of George Schulte, he had done some work for Barbara, including clearing her basement where the paintings were found. Re claimed that he had either purchased or was given the paintings by Barbara. It is undisputed that Barbara was suffering from dementia, although the degree and consistency of her condition are in dispute. She died in 2013.

Re produced documentation purportedly signed by
Barbara showing a lawful transfer to Re. The statements about
the provenance of the paintings was a pack of lies. In 2006,
he sold 12 fake Pollocks to one art collector for \$894,500.
The collector later confronted Re after a forensic expert
determined they were fakes.

From 2005 through January 2012, he sold 58 purported Pollocks to another collector for \$519,890, a price well below market. This second collector had the works examined by the International Foundation for Art Research, who confirmed that the 45 submitted paintings were fakes.

I have listened to the audio recording of Re's interaction with the second collector. Re sounded in control and lucid. His lies benefited from facial plausibility. He showed supposed empathy for the victim, but then tried to appeal to greed. He argued that keeping quiet was the victim's

best strategy for maintaining the value of the paintings and would also enable him to make restitution because he wouldn't be found out by law enforcement. At times he became a bully when he realized he was cornered, and this is said to be evidence of his pervasive mental illness.

A third collector bought three fake Pollocks for \$475,000, and was later threatened with bodily harm if he did not return two of the paintings.

Re sold one fake Pollock to a fourth collector residing in Texas. He offered to sell a Pollock to a fifth person, an art broker, in January 2014, and he also offered a fake Pollock on eBay using shill bidding.

John Re is 54 years of age. He is married with children aged 19 and 25. He was the victim of sexual abuse at the hands of a family member and others as a child. He has a long string of convictions dating back to age 20, disorderly conduct, assault in the second degree at age 24, escape from custody at age 27, criminal possession of stolen property at age 30, aggravated harassment in the second degree and false report of an incident at age 32, arising from a false bomb threat after he was laid off from a retail job, attempted possession of a forged instrument at 35, and other convictions.

He owns a submarine, which he calls Deep Quest, that he purchased for \$55,000 and now the value is at \$250,000. It is docked at a marina in East Hampton and is the subject of a

restraining order from this court. He claims to have spent a million dollars to refurbish the submarine. A financial picture of Mr. Re's holdings is difficult to establish, in part because he has never filed a tax return.

Dr. First, a forensic psychiatrist, has diagnosed him with dissociative identity disorder, which at an earlier point in time was known as multiple personality disorder. First met the defendant after his arrest in this case and had two face-to-face sessions with him.

Notably, on the advice of counsel, Re declined to sign a HIPAA release that would have enabled probation to review his psychiatric records.

First, however, did speak to Re's physician, who reported that Re was under his care since 2001. I note that Re told probation that he first sought counseling with this doctor, Dr. Friedes, in 1999. Re acknowledged that a Dr. Bernie saw him for 12 sessions in the mid-2000s, but did not accept the notion that he suffered from dissociative disorder.

In a moment of candor with Dr. First, Re said as follows: "I lied. I will say things to make myself look good even if they are not true. I am smart enough to create a situation or an atmosphere where it seems to be true. Not big lies. Not lies that are really evil."

As I have said, I accept that Mr. Re suffers from a mental illness. I also accept that his wife is ill and his

adult children have conditions requiring treatment. The fact that they have stood by him speaks well for Mr. Re. And I also note that there have been various points in his life when he has engaged in charitable acts towards other human beings, including a victim of a car crash and many homeless people.

As demonstrated by the lengthy audio recordings, John Re was able to persuade, cajole and parry with his victims. On the advice of his counsel, he declined to discuss his offense conduct with probation, as is his right.

Simply put, John Re is a con artist and a swindler. He excels at the art of manipulation and deception. He knew exactly what he was doing. He deserves just punishment. The public does need to be protected from this man. And this sentence should send a message to other persons who would be inclined to engage in a get-rich-quick scheme using fake art.

Principally, based upon the length of time of his deception and the depth of its planning, a nine-year period where he had ample time to consider and reflect on his actions, I conclude that a sentence somewhat above the advisory guideline range is appropriate.

The statutory provision is up to 20 years' imprisonment. The guideline range in this case is 37 to 46 months. And I intend to impose a sentence of 60 months' imprisonment, three years' supervised release, waive the fine based on limited assets, limited earning ability and the need

F5C8JOHS

to make restitution, impose restitution in the amount of \$2,225,807, and impose forfeiture and a special assessment of \$100. The foregoing is, in my view, sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve the purposes of Section 3553(a).

Does the defendant or his counsel have any objections to the Court's proposed sentence or to the statement of reasons for that sentence?

MR. FLOOD: We do object, your Honor.

THE COURT: Same question for the government.

MR. ADAMS: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: The defendant will please stand and I will impose sentence.

John Re, it is the judgment of this Court that you are hereby remanded to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for 60 months. Following release from imprisonment, you shall be placed on supervised release with the following terms and conditions:

You shall not commit another federal, state or local crime.

You shall not illegally possess a controlled substance.

You shall not possess a firearm or destructive device.

You shall refrain from unlawful use of a controlled substance.

You shall submit to one drug test within 15 days of

placement on supervised release and at least two unscheduled drug tests thereafter.

You shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by probation.

The standard conditions of supervision 1 through 13 are imposed with the following special conditions:

You shall participate in a mental health program approved by the probation office and shall continue to take any prescribed medications unless otherwise instructed by the health care provider. You shall contribute to the costs of services rendered not covered by third party payment.

The Court authorizes release of available psychological and psychiatric evaluations and reports to the health care provider.

You shall provide probation with access to any requested financial information.

You shall not incur any new credit card charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer.

You shall submit your person, place of business, vehicle and any other property -- computers, electronic communications, data storage devices and/or media -- under your control to a search on the basis that the probation officer has reasonable suspicion that contraband or evidence of a violation of the conditions of release may be found. The search must be

F5C8JOHS

conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner.

Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation.

You shall inform other residents that the premises may be subject to search pursuant to this condition.

You shall report to the nearest probation office within 72 hours of release from custody.

You shall make restitution in the amount of \$2,225,807 in accordance with the proposed order of restitution which has been tendered to the Court.

Is there any objection, Mr. Flood?

MR. FLOOD: No.

THE COURT: I will sign the order of restitution and it is so ordered.

Based on limited assets, limited earning ability, the fine is waived, and particularly based on the need to make restitution.

It is further ordered that you shall pay to the United States a special assessment of \$100, which shall be due immediately.

You shall forfeit to the United States a sum of money equal to 2.5 million in U.S. currency representing the amounts of proceeds obtained, directly or indirectly, as a result of the offense.

Mr. Flood, any objection to the proposed consent preliminary order of forfeiture money judgment?

1 MR. FLOOD: No, sir.

We will be seeking that the restoration program from the Department of Justice apply the forfeiture payments to restitution.

THE COURT: That is something that you will apply to the Department of Justice on, is that correct?

MR. FLOOD: I believe that's automatic. I am putting the government on notice of that.

THE COURT: Any objection to the preliminary order of forfeiture as to the submarine?

MR. FLOOD: No.

THE COURT: I am signing that.

Mr. Re, you have the right to appeal the sentence I have imposed on you. If you cannot afford the cost of an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal as a poor person. The time limits for filing a notice of appeal are brief and they are strictly enforced. If you request, the clerk of court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf immediately.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I will recommend that the Bureau of Prisons evaluate Mr. Re for appropriate physical and mental health treatment.

A designation request, Mr. Flood?

2.2

MR. FLOOD: We would like the Court to recommend that he be housed as close as possible, consistent with his designation score, to the eastern end of Long Island where his family resides.

THE COURT: So recommended.

The defendant is remanded in view of the risk and danger that there could be self-injury, which I will not take. So the defendant is remanded.

MR. FLOOD: We ask the Court to reconsider that. He has been on pretrial release now for quite some time, I believe over a year. His performance has been excellent. He has had no issues while on pretrial release whatsoever. I don't know the government's position on this, but to get his affairs in order we would ask for a surrender date.

THE COURT: The fact of the matter is the defendant entered a guilty plea on December 1, 2014. Up until today his fate was unknown. He urged, and I understand, he urged a nonincarceratory sentence, and he has now learned his fate. My concern is about his physical well-being, and I am not prepared to take the risk.

Any objection by the government to remand?

MR. ADAMS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything further from the government?

(212) 805-0300

MR. ADAMS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Any open counts?

F5C8JOHS MR. ADAMS: There are none. Anything further from the defendant? THE COURT: MR. FLOOD: No. THE COURT: We are adjourned.